

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-51 have been examined. With this Amendment Applicants cancel claims 1-3, 5-7, 15-18 and 20-22 without prejudice or disclaimer. After entry of this Amendment, claims 4, 8-14, 19 and 23-51 will be pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references cited with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 8, 2003.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and receipt of certified copies of the priority documents.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 5 and 38 have been objected to for various formalities. Claims 1 and 5 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the objections moot. However, the features of claims 1 and 5 have been incorporated into claims 4 and 8, respectively; therefore, Applicant address these objections.

Claim 1 has been objected to for reciting the phrase “said data driver circuit comprises by N switching blocks.” Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite “said data driver circuit comprises N switching blocks,” as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 1 has also been objected to as allegedly lacking antecedent basis for the phrase “said M video signal wirings.” Applicant submits that the phrase “M x P (P is a natural number) video signal wirings” set forth above the phrase cited by the Examiner is interpreted as “M video signal wirings x P video signal wirings” and therefore provides antecedent basis for the phrase cited by the Examiner.

Finally, claim 1 has been objected to as allegedly lacking antecedent basis for the phrases “the M switching elements” and “the M video signals.” Applicant submits that the phrase “M switching elements” provides antecedent basis for “the M switching elements” objected to by the Examiner.

With regard to the phrase “the M video signals,” Applicants have amended the phrase “said M x N video signals” to recite “M x N video signals.” This phrase should be interpreted as “M video signals x P video signals,” thereby providing antecedent basis for the phrase “the M video signals.”

Claim 5 has been objected to as allegedly lacking antecedent basis for the phrase “said M video signal wirings.” Applicants have amended the phrase to recite “M video signal wirings.”

With further regard to claim 5, the Examiner alleges that “an i-th set of video signal wirings” can refer to only two sets of wirings and therefore there is no point in Applicant claiming “ $i = 1, 2, \dots, P$ .” However, the “i-th set (one of  $i = 1, 2, \dots, P$ ) of the  $2M$  video signal wirings” refers to each set of M wirings that are connected at each of N switching blocks to the respective input terminals of the M switching elements. Since the claim recites N switching blocks, in this case  $P = N$ , where one set of M wirings will be connected at each switching block. Therefore, more than two sets of M wirings may exist.

Claim 38 has been objected to as allegedly lacking antecedent basis for “the switch block” in line four of the claim. Applicants have amended the phrase to recite “a switch block.”

Based on the arguments and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the claim objections be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 15-18 and 20-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,779,086 to Kanno et al. ("Kanno").

As noted above, Applicant has canceled these claims without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejections moot.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 36-51 are allowed.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 4, 8-14, 19 and 23-35 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Applicants have rewritten claims 4, 8, 19 and 23 in independent form including the limitations of their respective base claims and intervening claims. Applicants submit that rewritten claims 4, 8, 19 and 23 are patentable over the prior art, as indicated by the Examiner.

Claims 9-14 and 24-35, which depend from one of claims 4, 8, 19 and 23, are patentable over the prior art at least by virtue of their dependencies.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Application No. 10/656,297

Atty. Docket No. Q78098

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

*for*

 #40,706  
Howard L. Bernstein  
Registration No. 25,665

Date: July 19, 2006